

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 12-24, 42-43 and 46-63 are pending. Claim 42 has been amended. Claim 64 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application.

Interview Summary

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Dustin Nguyen for the courtesy of a telephonic interview conducted on February 27, 2008 with Applicants' representative Pablo Tapia. During the interview Applicants discussed the differences between the cited prior art references and the claims in the current application, as well as subject matter rejections presented by the Examiner.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 42, 43, and 46-64 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 64 has been canceled, and therefore, the rejection as to that claim is now moot. During the aforementioned interview, the Examiner confirmed that adding computing structure to Claim 42 would overcome the rejection. Claim 42 has been amended to include a microprocessor. Support for this amendment can be found on page 10 of the as-filed application. Applicants submit that Claim 42 recites patentable subject matter and therefore submit that the rejections as to Claim 42 should be withdrawn. Claims 43 and 46-63 depend from Claim 42, and therefore also recite patent subject matter.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 3-8, 12-24, 42-43 and 46-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,842,898 to Carlson et al. ("Carlson"), in view of

U.S. Patent 6,535,295 to Chinta et al. ("Chinta"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites:

A method for accessing status information related to a process, the method comprising:

receiving a request from a client for status information related to the process;

identifying nodes in a network, each of the nodes executing a distributed thread of the process;

polling each identified node for status information associated with the thread executing by the node, the status information generated by a script associated with the process;

receiving the status information from each of the nodes;

storing the status information in a data structure; and

enabling the client to access the status information.

Carlson does not disclose "identifying nodes in a network, each of the nodes executing a distributed thread of the process," or "polling each identified node for status information associated with the thread executing by the node, the status information generated by a script associated with the process," as recited in Claim 1.

Carlson discloses a monitor thread, which monitors a plurality of threads for their current status for determining whether the process associated with the thread has completed or not. Further, depending on the execution status of the thread, the thread is killed and the resources being used by it are cleaned. However, nowhere in Carlson is there a discussion of multiple nodes of a network performing various spawned threads of a process. While Carlson discusses multiple threads, such threads are not **distributed threads**, each thread being executed in a **different node of the network**.

Chinta does not cure the deficiencies of Carlson. Chinta discloses a system and method of performing message logging for networked applications running on application servers. Chinta does not discuss network nodes that execute a distributed thread of a process. Accordingly, Carlson and Chinta, alone or in combination, do not disclose all of the elements of Claim 1. For at least the above-identified reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Brossman in view of Chinta, and is allowable. Given that claims 3-8 and 12-24 depend from claim 1, claims 3-8 and 12-24 are also allowable for at least the same reasons. As such, **claims 3-8 and 12-24** depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1, 3-8 and 12-24 should be withdrawn.

Claim 42 recites:

A system comprising:
a computer microprocessor;
a process management system executing on a primary node in a network, the process management system configured to collect status information associated with a process, the processing management system also configured to divide the process into multiple threads and distribute the threads to multiple remote nodes in the network, the process management system further configured to receive the status information associated with the threads from each remote node and store the status information in a data structure accessible by any node with authorized access to the process management system; and
the remote nodes in the network, each remote node processing at least one of the threads associated with the process and including a script configured to provide the status information collected by the process management system.

As discussed above, neither Carlson nor Chinta disclose various nodes executing distributed threads of a process. Nothing in Carlson describes distributing threads of a process to multiple nodes. Accordingly, Carlson and Chinta fail to disclose or suggest

the process management system, the remote nodes, and their interactions, as recited in claim 42.

For at least the above-identified reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claim 42 is not rendered obvious by Carlson in view of Chinta and is allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 42 should be withdrawn.

Claims 43 and 46–63 depend from claim 42 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this response, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: March 19, 2008

By: /Pablo Tapia/

Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052-6399

Pablo Tapia, Reg. No.: 52,275
Attorney for Applicant
Direct telephone (425) 707-0058

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

March 19, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Signature